

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 August 2022

by L Hughes, BA (Hons), MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/22/3301841

7 Park Top Cottages, Otley Road, Eldwick, Bingley, BD16 3DB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Paul Vital against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01660/HOU, dated 11 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 30 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is demolish existing conservatory to front of property and replace with two storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - The effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 4 Heights Lane and 5 Park Top Cottages, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The property comprises a period back-to-back dwelling at the end of a row of back-to-back and through terrace dwellings in a residential area. It faces away from the highway with its garden in front. It hosts a single storey front extension and a dormer window, with similar alterations also present in some of the other properties in the row. Despite the alterations, the compact form of the original dwelling is apparent and is a key characteristic, shared with the wider terrace.
4. The proposed 2 storey extension would be dropped down from the main roofline, merged into the existing roof to some extent, and stepped at first floor. However, it would be very substantial in massing compared to the original property. It would therefore be insufficiently subservient such that it would over-dominate its original character. This is particularly because it would be on the front and principal elevation of the dwelling due to its back-to-back design. The extension would also harm the balance and character of the

whole terrace row and would be visually incongruous within this wider context. This is reinforced due to its location as the end terrace whereby it would act as an abrupt bookend, which would be particularly prominent in the skyline due to the drop in ground level directly adjacent.

5. While the footprint would be similar to that of the existing single storey extension, I find that the impact of the additional height would make a significant difference. Other extensions in the terrace are only single storey and much smaller in scale. The property is not subject to a direct roadside view, but the extension would still be visible from surrounding properties and streets. The lack of a close public view is not an overriding reason to accept harmful development.
6. The plans show render for the side walls. I note that the property includes some existing render on the gable end wall and the existing extension. However, overall it is of traditional construction with stonework being a significant and strongly cohesive feature for the whole terrace. The expanse of render which would be introduced would contrast with this and so would be harmful to this character.
7. The appellant wishes to improve the aesthetics compared to the existing conservatory, and parties commenting in support have also referenced this and the need to improve its security. However, this does not outweigh the harm which would be caused.
8. In conclusion therefore, the development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. This would be contrary to Policies SC9, DS1, and DS3 of the Bradford Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017). These policies aim for proposals to contribute to achieving good design and creating high quality places, and to ensure that new developments are appropriate to their context, specifically in relation to scale and materials, and in responding to the existing positive patterns of development which contribute to the character of the area.
9. The development would also be contrary to guidance in the Bradford Householder Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), which seeks that the size, position, and form of extensions should maintain or improve the character and quality of the original house and wider area.

Living conditions

10. The land level drops down significantly from 7 Park Top Cottages along its boundary with 4 Heights Lane. No. 4 is a bungalow and is relatively close to the boundary with a narrow wrap around garden, which makes this level change even more noticeable in experiencing the relationship between the two existing buildings. The addition of a large two storey extension in close proximity to this boundary would be over-dominating and harm the outlook from both windows and the garden of No. 4.
11. The proposed extension would also be sited close to the conjoined neighbour at 5 Park Top Cottages. The height and massing of the extension would affect living conditions in terms of outlook from the ground and first-floor windows of No. 5, and would also affect the outlook from its narrow garden.

12. In conclusion, the development would result in an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of 4 Heights Lane and 5 Park Top Cottages, with particular regard to outlook. This would be contrary to the Core Strategy Policy DS5, which aims for proposals to make a positive contribution to people's lives, and specifically seeks to not harm the amenity of existing or prospective residents. The development would also be contrary to the guidance in the SPD which aims for extensions to not over dominate or seriously damage outlook to neighbours.

Conclusion

13. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole. With no other material considerations outweighing this conflict, for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L Hughes

INSPECTOR